

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Mondays, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XV, No. 4

MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1921

WHOLE No. 400

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN CLASSICAL LEAGUE.

The following additions have been made to the list of publications.

*The Classics for America*, by Calvin Coolidge, Vice-President of the United States. An address delivered July, 1921, in Philadelphia, before the American Classical League. This compact and powerful statement puts the case for classical education on the highest moral and patriotic grounds. It should be read by every American who cares for education. Single copy, 5 cents, 25 copies for \$1.00, 100 copies for \$3.00, 500 copies for \$10.00.

*A Reasonable Plea for the Classics*, by Gonzalez Lodge, Professor of Latin and Greek in Teachers College, Columbia University. An exact and discriminating review of the present situation and the claims of the Classics. Especially useful for teachers. Single copy, 5 cents, 5 copies for 15 cents, 50 copies for \$1.00.

The above prices include postage, but are granted to members of the League only, as the publications are sold at cost.

Membership in the League may be obtained by remitting 25 cents yearly to the Secretary of your local or Regional Classical Association, or, if you are not a member of such an Association, by a payment of \$1.00 yearly to the Secretary of the American Classical League.

The dues are used to enlist your interest in the work, and to pay for new publications. The publications listed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, Volume XIV, No. 16, (February 28, 1921) are still obtainable.

Write for a complete list of publications, to

PROFESSOR SHIRLEY H. WEBER, Secretary,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

and send all orders to the Secretary-Treasurer,

PROFESSOR S. H. WEBER,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

*"No book ever  
failed because  
it was too simple".*

Note these facts about  
**Collar and Daniell's  
First Year Latin, Revised**

The lessons are not overcrowded. With but three exceptions, no lesson is longer than two pages.

The grading is carefully adjusted to the capacity of the pupil. The authors believe that nothing should be taught to-day that properly belongs in to-morrow's lesson.

The rules are reduced to lowest terms.

The constructions are limited to those recommended by Byrne for the first year.

The vocabulary is short.

The result is a book that is well-organized in construction, simple, and easy to teach.

**Ginn and Company**

Boston    New York    Chicago    London  
Atlanta    Dallas    Columbus    San Francisco

**SMYTH'S GREEK SERIES FOR  
COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS**

Edited under the supervision of *Herbert Weir Smyth, Ph.D.*, Eliot Professor of Greek Literature, Harvard University

Including Editions of

**Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Demosthenes, Euripides, Herodotus,  
Homer, Lysias, Plato, Sophocles, Thucydides, Xenophon**

With text Editions  
also volumes on

**Greek Archaeology, Greek Literature, Greek Religion,  
and Greek Sculpture**

22 volumes in attractive and uniform binding

**AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XV, No. 4

MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1921

WHOLE No. 400

## PROFESSOR OGLE ON CLASSICAL EDUCATION

In Education, for January, 1921 (41.312-319), Professor M. B. Ogle, of the University of Vermont, has a paper entitled A Neglected Aspect of Education. The fundamental elements of education, he declares, are appreciation of form and beauty, and the moral, ethical, and spiritual development of man. An appreciation of form and beauty one can get from a study of nature; from such study, however, one can make no advance in moral, ethical, and spiritual development.

Nature is . . . absolutely unmoral. Her law is the law . . . that might makes right, that the weak have no prerogatives which the strong are bound to respect, that to the victor belong the spoils.

It is only from companionship with men, and especially with the master spirits of the race, that we can gain knowledge of the things that make for moral, ethical, and spiritual development (313). The teachers of literature, therefore, are the guides to the sources whence alone can be drawn any conception of moral and spiritual ideals (314). Men must pay more attention than they do now to questions of literary form and beauty, and to the moral and spiritual value of the messages left by the writers with whom they deal (314).

In this connection, Professor Ogle urges, the teachers of Latin have an especial opportunity (314-315).

If, indeed, the greatness of a literature is to be measured, not by beauty of form only, but by the universality of its appeal, by the intellectual and spiritual influence which it exercises upon the generations of men, there is no literature which has a better claim to supremacy than the Latin; there are no names, for example, that have meant so much to as many people for as long a time as have the names of Vergil, Cicero, and Horace. It is not too much to assert that without the works of these three men, to say nothing of other great writers, the history of western thought, of western literature, of western morals, would not have been what it has been. And one cannot help feeling that had not they and their message to mankind been largely forgotten, had we not failed to pay heed to the experiences of the great people of which they are the truest representatives, we should not be in our present slough of despond.

Professor Ogle believes that teachers of Cicero and teachers of Vergil have specially favorable opportunity to contribute to the moral, ethical, and spiritual development of their pupils. He reminds us of what St. Augustine said, in his Confessiones 3. 4, of the extent to which he was influenced by the Hortensius of Cicero. Professor Ogle translates, or paraphrases, the passage, as follows:

'Now by the usual course of reading I came upon a certain book of Cicero. This book of his is called an exhortation to philosophy, and is entitled Hortensius. And the book altered my feelings and turned my prayers to thee, O God, and made me have other purposes and desires. All my hopes came to be vain in my eyes and worthless, and I longed with an incredible yearning of the heart for the immortality of wisdom, and began to arise that I might turn to thee. I was strongly roused and kindled and inflamed to love and to seek and to obtain and to embrace, not this, or that sect, but wisdom herself, whatever it might be'.

Teachers of Cicero therefore should, urges Professor Ogle (316), make their students realize that the moral philosophy of Cicero was the chief source of the Christian ethics upon which our civilization has been built; that it was the discovery of the individuality of Cicero, as revealed in his Letters, which led men in the Middle Ages to break the shackles of authority of Church and State, and to become again intellectually and spiritually free, thus making possible the Renaissance: and to show their students

how the ideals of the nations which fought in our Great War are reflected in their attitude toward Cicero, in that he, the great *popularis consul*, the unceasing advocate of individual freedom checked by individual responsibility, has been condemned, despised and ridiculed in Germany, honored, loved and idealized in Italy, France and England.

Teachers of Vergil, he continues, have a still greater privilege (316-319),

that of interpreting . . . the voice of the poet and the prophet who has tried to solve the riddle of life and to fix the place of the individual amid the flux of things . . .

To Vergil's mind it is only through toil and sorrow and suffering that man can develop as an individual and learn to have love and sympathy for his fellows. The value of vicissitude, of the sweat of the brow and the tears of the heart, in the forming of character, is the chief burden of the Georgics, especially of that passage in which the poet tries to reconcile the two great theories of the origin of man: the one, that of the Stoics, according to which man has, owing to his weakness, fallen from a divine estate; the other, that of the Epicureans, according to which man has developed from a material atom. Vergil accepted the Stoic doctrine of the divine nature of man, as "a part and parcel of God", and of his fall, but, in his eyes, this fall was not a curse but a blessing in disguise, sent designedly from heaven in order that man, by means of toil and hardship, might win strength and courage and wisdom, and again work upward to the divine. "God himself", he tells us, "has willed that man's way be not easy, and by vicissitudes he has sharpened the wits of man". And again, "Toil overcomes all obstacles,—unceasing toil, and the pressure of need amid hardships". Not only, therefore, does knowledge come, as Emerson puts it, "by working hands", not only "by doing does man unfold himself",



but by suffering also, and both are necessary, says Vergil, for the formation of the highest manhood. In the Aeneid, also, in that portion which is read by high school students, the same great truth is set before us. Both Aeneas and Dido are what they are because of what they have done and suffered. It finds noble expression in that deathless line spoken by the Queen when she receives the shipwrecked Trojans: "Well do I know sorrow, and it teaches me to aid those in distress". It was this sympathy, born from her own sad life, which had moved her to paint upon the walls of her temple the sad picture of Troy's overthrow—the picture which wrings from Aeneas, as he gazes upon it, a cry of woe over the heaviness of his burden, a prayer that he might put from him his cup of suffering, but at the same time brings him comfort and inspiration and hope; it is the token of sympathy, the assurance that "human hearts are touched by human woe".

In this assurance of the value of suffering to the individual, Vergil found, in part at least, an explanation of its universality and a justification for it. But is even this enough to justify the sorrow of the Trojan women, as they sit there on the shore weeping for the dead Anchises, but weeping each one, as she gazes out over the sea, for her own sad lot? Is it enough to justify the broken heart of the old Evander, as he weeps over the body of his only son, the brave and beauteous Pallas? Is it enough to justify the tears of the fathers and mothers of our own day who have suffered the same loss which Evander suffered? To these questions, also, which, after all, are the real riddle of life, Vergil gives us an answer, and his answer is one which every young student of the Aeneid should know and ponder over. He found it in the story of his hero, a man of sorrow, whose dearest hopes lay buried in the dust of Troy, beneath the walls of which he fain would have fallen, and yet one who bore his burden bravely, with a smile upon his lips in spite of the deep woe in his heart, because he knew that he was striving toward an ideal, aiding, however falteringly, in the carrying out of a divine purpose. To Vergil this ideal was Rome's work in the world, and this work was, as he himself expresses it, "to crown peace with law". Moments there were when Aeneas forgot, one poignant moment when he and Dido proved false to their own high character and to their ideals, and violated the moral law. Dido's punishment was death: Aeneas', a blasted hope and a broken heart, and a resumption of his cross to travel again his weary road. But in the light of Rome's work in the world, in the light of the lofty ideal which is held up to us in the writings of Cicero and Horace no less than in those of Vergil—the crowning of peace with law—we have both an explanation of the hardships of the individual and a justification of the ways of God to man.

Such, in part at least, is the message which comes to us from the intercourse with the great spirits of the Roman world. That we stand today in urgent need of their message no one, in the present state of things, will deny. For, as has lately been well said, it is not a contest of strength that the world faces, but of morals, and what our youth needs, therefore, is not so much the lessons to be learned from an investigation of birds and flowers and rocks, as the lessons to be learned from the reading and the study of good books. And not the least of these are the books of Cicero, Vergil, and Horace, which, for two thousand years, have nurtured the mind and spirit of man, and which speak to us of the dignity of toil, of the value of vicissitude for the upbuilding of character, of the responsibility of the individual, of the necessity of an ideal, if we are to gain a broader view of heaven's purposes and earth's needs,—such an ideal as that of Rome in her greatness, the crowning of peace with law.

C. K.

### PROMETHIUS BOUND OF AESCHYLUS<sup>1</sup>

It hardly seems as if anything could have been left unsaid or unthought about the Prometheus of Aeschylus in all these centuries. And yet, in considering the problems which such a drama undoubtedly presents, our minds are often beclouded by inherited traditions and prejudices concerning the ancient Greeks and their literature. We know that some of these traditions originated long ago in very dull and narrow minds; but we still preserve them by a kind of perverted scholarship. It may be that with respect to the Prometheus we have all been influenced, more or less unconsciously, by such traditions and prejudices. Moreover, it is certainly a mistake to attempt to synthesize, as many scholars are prone to do, all that the ancient Greeks have said on any subject, or even to interpret every saying of an ancient author by what the same author has said elsewhere. For example, it may be that the conception of Zeus presented in the Prometheus is fundamentally different from the conception of Zeus in the Agamemnon.

It is a dangerous practice also to interpret ancient literature as if it were modern. The danger lies in our natural tendency to project upon ancient times thoughts and feelings which are natural and common now, but which were alien to the ancient world, thereby ignoring the ideas and beliefs of the ancients which we have outgrown. On the other hand, it is equally dangerous to assume that the ancients thought and felt otherwise than we, especially if we hold, as we do, that among the ancient Greeks were some of the ablest minds which the human race has produced. This assumption would stretch every utterance of an ancient thinker upon the Procrustean bed of our traditional conception of the ancient world, and at the outset beg the question in the prosecution of any nonconformist.

There is an idea, which is present in much of our modern thinking on matters of religion, that, as the human race advances, the religious views of the more enlightened and spiritually-minded tend to become more and more remote from those more primitive notions embodied in a traditional literature and mythology, or in the creed and ritual prescribed by an organized priesthood, and preserved essentially unchanged by the religious conservatism and superstition of the masses. This may seem to some an essentially modern idea, and foreign to the ancient world. But it is certain at least that contemporaries of Aeschylus were convinced that the conceptions of the gods involved in their traditional literature and in popular belief were irreconcilable with what gods must be, if there are gods at all. It seems clear to me that Aeschylus also held this view. I do not mean merely that an interesting comparison may be drawn between the religious ideas of Aeschylus and our own; I mean that certain religious ideas similar to ours were consciously held by Aeschylus, and were deliberately

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Hunter College, April 23, 1921.

incorporated by him in this drama. If this is so, then we may properly seek to interpret this drama in accordance with these ideas.

The common interpretation of the Prometheus is that the poet took certain well-known myths, and with his artistic genius gave to them dramatic form. If these familiar stories are all this drama contains, there is no reason why anyone might not understand it completely, and doubtless this is all it did contain for the mass of Aeschylus's audience. These stories are presented in scenes which involve much that is theatrical or spectacular, amounting sometimes to what we should expect in a modern melodrama. How the audience must have enjoyed seeing Might and Force drag in the struggling Prometheus and hold him to the cliff, while the reluctant Hephaestus pinioned him! How they must have wondered at the sea-maidens arriving in their winged car, or at old Oceanus with his dragon! How the horned Io and the account of her wanderings must have interested them! How they must have been thrilled by the awful cataclysm at the end! What might seem to us ridiculous in these spectacles was not so for those who believed that these supernatural beings really existed, and who were familiar from childhood with stories of such occurrences. Theatrical effects seem to me characteristic of Aeschylus's plays, and the chief reason for their notorious popularity. Processions and spectacular scenes crowd the stage in the *Oresteia* and the *Seven Against Thebes*. These were plays which everyone, however unintelligent, could and did enjoy. And when we remember the extreme beauty of its verses, the sublime fortitude of its hero, and the pathos with which the innocent and pitiful Io is presented, we need not wonder at the success of the Prometheus.

But surely this is not all that the Prometheus contains. Justly it has been called the most profoundly moving drama of all literature. Profundity is not necessarily involved in the legends selected, and it cannot be by accident that through his presentation of these legends the poet awakens in us the deepest thoughts concerning the existence and nature of divinity. That Aeschylus produced a play suited to the comprehension of a crowd is evident. That the same play had a deeper meaning for the more thoughtful in his audience is also possible. Some modern scholars, seeking such a deeper meaning, see in this, as in many other Greek tragedies, human character exhibited on a supernatural scale. Prickard, for example, sees in Prometheus a mythological figure like Oedipus, in whom a human character struggling under overwhelming injustice and suffering is presented to view. But neither Prometheus nor Io is an obviously human type; the human traits they display are incidental rather than essential to this drama. Others hold that Prometheus is the uncompromising champion of liberty, crushed in the conflict with autocracy, ultimately to arise triumphant. But Prometheus in this drama is the benefactor of the human race, not a champion in any sense; Io is the innocent victim of a ruthless tyranny.

There is, however, another interpretation of this drama, which is at least more plausible. To many Prometheus is the heroic sinner, the rebel against the divine order of things-as-they-are, to which all should conform. Such persons hold that the essence of morality for the ancient Greeks was conformity to the transcendent rhythm of the universe, of which each individual is an integral part. From this point of view it was right and necessary that Prometheus should be 'rhythmized', that is, reduced, by torments if need be, to conformity. Thus they hold that Prometheus was for the Greeks a typically 'tragic' figure, involved by fate and circumstance in the hopeless antithesis of two resistless forces, in this case the passion for liberty and the duty of conformity; for us the balance is unequal and our sympathies are wholly with Prometheus, only because conformity to an organization of the universe which included the traditional Greek gods has ceased to be the ultimate morality.

But this explanation is not complete, not wholly satisfactory. It fails to account for certain features of this drama which constantly recur, forcing themselves upon our attention. Why, for example, is the statement so often reiterated that the gods, against whom Prometheus rebelled, are *new* and *transient*, even though themselves contrasted with ephemeral men? Or why are these gods, with the possible exception of Hephaestus, represented throughout as so extremely and repulsively anthropomorphic, wanton and vile? Why are these two legends, in which the gods appear at their very worst, united here, although there is nothing in the traditional mythology which associated Io directly with Prometheus? Why is it that, although Oceanus, Io, Hermes, and even the sea-maidens urge Prometheus to submit and conform, their pleas are made so weak and unconvincing? They must have seemed unconvincing even to the ancient Greeks as we commonly imagine them. How is it, finally, that the last scenes of the play glorify Prometheus's uncompromising resistance on the ground that the existing authority will be ultimately dethroned or transformed?

Of course Prometheus was a mythological figure, well known to all of Aeschylus's audience. And perhaps this was all he was to most. He is presented here in form more or less human, and with human characteristics. How else could he be presented on the Greek stage? Even such abstractions as Might and Force are presented here in human form. But, like many other mythological figures, Prometheus, as his name implies, is also a personification thinly veiled in the myth. Primarily it is the mythological figure which Aeschylus took as his hero, and conformably with the practice of the Greek tragedians he introduces into his drama nothing which is contradictory to the accepted legends. Within the bounds of this convention, however, the myths and mythological figures are made the vehicles of his thought.

Prometheus belonged to the ages of Uranus and of Cronus, as well as to this present age of Zeus. This

drama does not explain how Uranus was overthrown, but we are told how the fall of Cronus came about. When the Titans undertook to defend Cronus, Prometheus offered his services to them; their strength and his intelligence united would have sufficed perhaps to maintain the older order. But the Titans would have none of him; they chose to rely on force alone. Hence Prometheus, knowing that force without intelligence could not succeed against deceit, joined Zeus, a willing ally to a willing lord; Zeus the deceitful, guided by intelligence, was better than blind force. By the intelligence of Prometheus Zeus was enabled to overthrow Cronus and all the old régime of heaven, making himself supreme. By reason of the power thus acquired through Prometheus's aid Zeus assigned to each of the lesser gods his special rights and functions. Yet later in the play Prometheus says that this also was done by him and not by Zeus: 'Who else but me did make complete assignment to these new gods of all their several functions?'. Once enthroned, this Zeus became autocratic, violent, and ruthless; he neglected, then sought to destroy utterly the present human race. But Prometheus withstood him for the love he bore to man. He gave men hopes—blind hopes, it is true, but hopes that freed them from too anxious presage of an ultimate doom. He taught men all they know. Unthinking brutes before, he made them advance step by step through all the stages of their civilization. He gave them fire and taught its use, thereby making possible all those activities which depend on its employment. In short, as he says himself: 'All arts to mortals from Prometheus come'. Thus by Prometheus, and by him alone, there was provided for the race of men life which was comparable, in some respects at least, to that of the gods themselves.

Because he withstood Zeus and befriended man, Prometheus incurred the enmity of this new ruler of the universe, and therefore he was transfixed and pinioned upon the lonely crag at the uttermost limits of the world. Yet he foreknew that unless he, the prisoner, saved the tyrant, the tyrant himself would in time be overthrown, in consequence of some act which he would perpetrate unless he was deterred. What that act would be is not fully explained; only it would be a marriage, one more last sexual anthropomorphic union among the gods. But this deliverance of Zeus would not be effected unless Prometheus was delivered from these bonds. His release would not be by the hand of Zeus. The liberator who would release Prometheus would be one born of woman, descendant of Epaphos, the son of Io, whom Zeus would engender, not sexually, but by touch alone. Therefore Prometheus, though he suffered, would not submit to the tyranny of this upstart ruler, whom he himself had once enthroned. He knew that this ruler could not wholly destroy him, not though he heaped more torments, ten-fold more, upon his helpless head, and compassed the ruin of the earth and the sky in the outpourings of his wrath. Twice already Prometheus had seen such rulers of the universe swept

from their seats of power. He would yet live to see the present tyrants in their turn dethroned, if they would not submit themselves to his guidance and restraint. The time would come when he would be released from bondage, and then, if fate willed it, would this Zeus turn once more to seek his love and league with him, as eager as he would be eager for this new alliance.

What can this Prometheus be but reasoning, foreseeing Intelligence, which alone bestows on gods and men alike their powers and their prerogatives? There even seems to be a clear hint of this interpretation in the opening scene of the play, where Cratus says to Prometheus: 'Falsely the gods call thee Intelligence; thou thyself dost need intelligence to get thee clear of this skillful work of ours'. But this Intelligence may be enthralled and tortured by the very gods whom he has himself enthroned, and then some one of the race of men must needs release him.

Who are these gods, these new and transient gods, who appear in this strange drama? They are so vile! It was inherent in the legends of Prometheus and of Io that the gods involved therein should appear like men; but surely their anthropomorphism is here unnecessarily emphasized by Aeschylus. It seems as if the poet had tried in every way to make the gods appear as evil as possible. Not much is said about the other gods, but Zeus at least is vividly portrayed. He is arbitrary, irresponsible, violent, lustful, cruel, and ruthless. He is a tyrant. Yet we feel that he is a type of all the rest. Hera is lightly touched upon, but appears to be as human and cruel as her spouse. Hermes is truculent, servile, and ridiculous. Hephaestus alone appears reluctant to execute the cruel orders of his master. But all alike are enemies of Prometheus, and equally hated by him. They are hostile to the human race. Nearly the whole play is devoted to the display of the vindictive cruelty of these gods to Prometheus, whose only fault was that he befriended man, and to Io, whose only fault was that she was lovely.

Are these the gods in whom Aeschylus believed? That he was a deeply religious man, and believed that gods really existed, is evident from his other dramas. But the Zeus or the Prometheus is very different from that mighty, inscrutable deity of whom the chorus in the Agamemnon sings, who rules the world with justice, and who, though he has set this law to be supreme for men, that 'Knowledge comes from suffering', has done this to promote righteousness in men, and not in wanton cruelty. The gods of the Prometheus are the gods of the traditional Greek mythology. They are not eternal. There have been other gods before them, and they themselves in turn will pass away. Real gods, if there be real gods, do not change; but men's conceptions of them change. The conceptions of the gods presented in the Prometheus are those which the Greeks of Aeschylus's time had inherited from a cruder and less spiritual age, embodied in their myths and sacred literature, and developed by the imagina-



tions of their poets and artists into characters as repulsive to the thoughtful Greeks of the fifth century before Christ as they are to us. Such gods as these are gods created by man in his own image and by him exalted until they enchain and torture the intelligence by which they were created, terrorize and disgust their creators. The intelligence by which they were created will survive them. But man alone can liberate the intelligence by which they may be reconstructed in accordance with man's own intellectual and spiritual development. For such gods have no objective reality; they exist only in men's minds.

This play of Aeschylus is complete in itself. It matters little whether or not it was one of a trilogy treating a single subject, like the several chapters of a book. We know little, practically nothing, of the other plays which are commonly grouped with this. We do not know with certainty that they were grouped together by their author. It is not necessary that we should. The problem with which Aeschylus was dealing in this extant play is definitely presented to us.

The same problem arises for every set of men who, having advanced beyond a more primitive stage of their development, seek to hold fast religious conceptions inherited from an earlier period, because these are incorporated in a literature which they consider sacred, and because all are reluctant to abandon or reconstruct their religious beliefs. The same problem faces the world to-day, and for the same reasons. We should not wonder, then, that Aeschylus in his time dealt with this problem in veiled language, and so cautiously that many in all these intervening centuries have failed to recognize, or at least to agree upon, his deeper meaning.

Those who speak out plainly on such subjects are often held in great dishonor, and are thought by many to be doing incalculable harm. Such protestants have arisen in all ages; there are many of them now. But little good will come of all their argument until the time is ripe. Till then the wisest speak with caution, and try not to defeat their purpose by extreme statements which might destroy beliefs which many hold most dear, and which many would be unable to reconstruct or to replace.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM K. PRENTICE

## REVIEWS

The Greek Theater of the Fifth Century Before Christ (University of California Publications in Classical Philology: Volume 7). By James Turney Allen. Berkeley (1920). Pp. 119. Illustrated. \$1.25.

Many books and articles have been appearing on the Greek theater and drama in the last few years, the most important being R. C. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and its Drama* (compare my review in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 12.69-71); J. Geffcken, *Die Griechische Tragödie* (Teubner, 1918: reviewed by Professor Edward Fitch, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*

14. 100-101); Romagnoli, *Il Teatro Greco* (Milan, 1918); and a book entitled *Das Theaterwesen im Altertum*, which has recently been published in Germany by Miss Margarete Bieber, giving in 109 views and descriptions of most of the theaters that have been preserved, and of costumes, masks, etc.—a very thorough corpus of the Greek and Roman theater. Professor Allen has been interested in the Greek drama for many years and has already published several articles and reviews on literary and archaeological problems connected with the Greek drama (e. g. *Greek Acting in the Fifth Century*, University of California Publications in Classical Philology 2. 279-289). But the problem of the reconstruction of the fifth century theater at Athens has had for him a strange fascination, and he has devoted many hours to it, and finally got a clue to its solution in the spring of 1918, whose nature he indicated in his short article, *The Key to the Reconstruction of the Fifth Century Theater at Athens* (University of California Publications in Classical Philology 5. 55-58). The nature of this clue is set forth in Chapter III of the present book (20-42), *The Theater of the Fifth Century*, and is illustrated by Fig. 20 on page 30. Here the inner corners of the *paraskenia* of the Lycurgean scene-building, nearest the orchestra, coincide exactly with the inner edge of the retaining wall of the old orchestra-terrace; and it is shown that the inner sides of the *paraskenia* and the wall connecting them at the rear exactly fit the circle of the old terrace (for the early fifth-century theater see Professor Allen's own interesting model, reproduced on page 23, Fig. 16). The north-south diameter of the remaining portion of this terrace is the same as that of the fourth-century orchestra; for, if a line be drawn between the *paraskenia* and at the same distance back from their front line as the Hellenistic *proskēnion* stood back of the Hellenistic *paraskenia* (about four feet), this line is an exact chord of the outer circle of the old terrace-wall. These certainly are striking coincidences and, in view of the Greek love of geometry and symmetry—dynamic, static, or otherwise—, they are hardly accidental, so that it would seem that Professor Allen has really made an important discovery. He draws the conclusion that, before the theater was moved, the scene-building had been erected both on and about the orchestra-terrace. In other words, the Lycurgean orchestra was merely a counterpart of the Sophoclean and Euripidean orchestra, which was probably used also for the last plays of Aeschylus. Professor Flickinger says that the fifth-century theater had neither *paraskenia* nor a columned proscenium; but Professor Allen shows the great probability of *paraskenia*. In view of the variety of scenes required by the Greek plays it is unlikely that there was such a proscenium as Professor Allen reconstructs. Professor Allen further thinks (see especially Chapter VIII, *The Origin of the Proskēnion*, 107-116), that the fifth-century scene-building served as a model for the building which replaced it later. He thinks (Chapter IV, *The Evidence of the Dramas*, 43-68) that the *skene* (= 'hut' or 'booth'), which was at

first a flimsy structure, came in the fifth century to be a substantial building, two stories high. He also points out that, when the scene-building represented a house or a temple, no steps were placed before the door. I should go further and say that this was always true, and that Fiechter's plan (Fig. 12) of the fourth-century theater with steps, which seems to have influenced the new so-called Greek theater being built at the University of Virginia (not an accurate representation of a Greek or a Roman theater any more than are the seven or so others in the United States, including that at Professor Allen's own University) is also wrong. I know of no evidence for such steps, which are also frequent in such English adaptations of Greek theaters as that at Bradfield College (reproduced as Fig. 22 in Professor Knapp's paper, *The Roman Theater*, in *Art and Archaeology* 1.204). Some plays required a portico. Professor Allen thinks that this was not represented by painting (which I am still inclined to think was the method of representing the background in the fifth century), or by a projection into the orchestra, but by being set into the building as in ordinary Greek houses. He puts forward a sixth proposal—very improbable—with regard to the *proskēnion*, that it was in point of origin the Aeschylean *skēnē* itself, that the *skēnē* could not possibly have been as ugly as it is in the reconstructions of Fiechter, Flickinger, and Döpfeld (Figs. 12, 22, 23), and that, therefore, the *proskēnion* was not added to the *skēnē* as a decoration screen, but was the scene-building itself. This rather startling thesis will probably cause much criticism. While scholars will probably approve the main discovery of Professor Allen, the conjectural reconstruction of the scene-building at Athens toward the close of the fifth century (Fig. 31) will hardly be accepted. In this reconstruction the first story has seven columns on either side of a single door; the intercolumniation before the door is very wide, and on the frieze here there are three triglyphs to one over each of the other intercolumniations (the wide central front intercolumniation of the Propylaea has only two). The *paraskēnia* have six columns each, but the columns are much closer together. The second story is the worst part of the reconstruction. If Athena in the Ajax does not appear on the roof (which Professor Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and its Drama*, 291, and others deny), she could mount the *proskēnion* from the rear in some way, as could Zeus in Aeschylus's *Psychostasia*. The latter play seems to require some sort of a second story (before 458; not before 430, as Professor Flickinger argues), but it need have no such background as in Figure 31, page 112.

In Professor Allen's reconstruction there is a very awkward platform, too long, too broad, especially over the *paraskēnia*, if it was not used for acting; also a very unsightly rear wall absolutely unadorned, except with pilasters at the ends, with a very broad opening in the middle, and with an ungainly cornice and roof above. This is a very unlikely restoration, for which we need more evidence. The Greeks would hardly have built, at the height of their artistic career, such an unsymmetrical and ugly building, even in wood.

When the change was made to stone, the original portion of the *proskēnion* would hardly continue to be a temporary wooden erection. This is an interesting architectural and archaeological problem, but we have no evidence concerning it in the way of architectural remains, and may never have. The dramas themselves help little, for, while Euripides, unlike Sophocles, who excludes such matters, never misses an opportunity to mention details of architecture, sculpture, and painting, his descriptions are not detailed enough for us to base conclusions on them. It is only fair to say that Professor Allen states in his Preface that he himself has some misgivings about the reconstruction of the Sophoclean scene-building; but he has nevertheless illuminated the problem in many ways. The rest of his book, which does not limit itself to the fifth century, as the title would indicate, is an admirable and sane discussion of the various recent theories regarding the early theater, the fourth and the fifth century theaters at Athens, the evidence of the dramas, changes of the setting and how they were effected, the alleged *prothyron* of the vase-paintings, and the origin of the *proskēnion*. The book is written in a readable, interesting, and attractive style.

There are some misprints, but very few errors. On page 25 the facsimile of the inscription cited has a three-barred sigma, but the text a four-barred sigma. The Corpus of Greek Inscriptions (to which one should refer by I.G., and not by CIA, as is done at page 26, note 51), gives (1.499) the four-barred sigma, though Koehler is cited for a three-barred sigma. In any case the inscription is not Attic, as Professor Allen says, for it has the Ionic lambda and the Ionic eta, with which the form of sigma should be four-barred, the form used after 446 B.C. The other inscription cited on page 26 is Attic, but Professor Allen gives the wrong form of epsilon and omits a kappa after the epsilon.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY DAVID M. ROBINSON

#### SOME NEW VOLUMES IN THE OXFORD JUNIOR LATIN SERIES

In *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 12. 118-119 I noticed briefly some volumes of a new series of annotated editions of the Latin Classics, called the Oxford Junior Latin Series, under the general editorship of Mr. C. E. Freeman, Sometime Assistant Master at Westminster. The books noticed then included editions, by Mr. Freeman, of Livy, Book I, of Ovid, *Selections*, of Aeneid, Book 4, and of Aeneid, Book 6. In *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14. 23 Professor John R. Crawford reviewed another booklet of the series—an edition of Livy, Book 22, by John Pyper.

Mr. Freeman has now edited Aeneid, Book 10. In the Introduction, pages 5-11, he repeats the account of Vergil and the analysis of Books 1-5 given by him in the Introduction to his edition of Aeneid 6. On pages 12-16 he continues the analysis through Book 10. On pages 16-26 there is a very interesting



discussion of Fate and the Gods <in Vergil>. On pages 26-30 there is a discussion of The Metre of the Aeneid, identical with that in his earlier editions, except that the illustrations are chosen from Book 10. There are, finally, thirty-six pages of useful notes (67-102), an Index of Proper Names (103-106), and a Vocabulary (107-140).

To the same series belong editions of Book 1 and Book 2, by J. Jackson (author, by the way, of a translation of the Aeneid, in the Oxford University Press Library of Translations [1908], which is very good, except, perhaps, in a fondness, to my mind, excessive, for archaic English words). In the Introduction Mr. Jackson writes about The Life of Vergil (5-8), and about Works of Vergil (8-15): the accounts are Mr. Jackson's own (not Mr. Freeman's). What he says of the Eclogues and the Georgics is better than what Mr. Freeman writes of those works. On the other hand, he writes less fully of the Aeneid itself. The notes are good. I would mention especially those on Ille ego. . . horrentia Martis, 1 a, 1 b, 1 c, 1 d (Mr. Jackson thinks there is "no very strong reason for doubting that <Vergil> wrote both passages <i. e. 1 a - 1 d, 1-4>, if only by way of experiment"), 1.15-16, 175-176, 195-197, 242-245, 261-263, 327-330, 367-368, 395-396, 592-593, 607-608, 673-675, 703-704. In connection with 175-176 (the passage in which Achates makes a fire) I may refer to a note on these lines by Professor R. J. Bonner, in The Classical Journal 1.49-50, under the title, A Note on *Rapuit* in Vergil Aeneid I.176. The view there presented is accepted by Messrs. Fairclough and Brown, in their edition of Aeneid, Books I-VI (Benjamin H. Sanborn and Co., Boston, 1908: see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2. 68-69), and by Professor Fairclough, in his translation of the Aeneid in The Loeb Classical Library. But, to my mind, *rapuit* cannot in itself suggest the idea which Professor Bonner assigns to it here, that of swinging back and forth. Had Vergil meant that, he should have added *huc illuc*, or the like.

In his Introduction to Book 2, pages 5-15, Mr. Jackson repeats his account of the life and works of Vergil. One sentence about the Aeneid is worth quoting (14-15):

And yet to most readers, even in the twentieth century when poetry is a richer and stranger thing than ever it was in the ancient world, these and all kindred flaws shrink very nearly into nothingness before the nobility of thought and diction, the pure patriotism, and the large human sympathy which are the key-notes of the work.

New matter in this Introduction appears on pages 15-18, under the caption The Siege of Troy.

Good notes in this edition are those on 8-9, 15, 21, 37, 47, 111, 124-125, 130-131, 142-143, 157, 174, 178-179, 193-194, 201, 256-257, 263, 272-273, 293, 325, 349-350, 377, 438-441, 453-455, 530, 567-588, 616, 738-740.

Each of Mr. Jackson's volumes contains an Index of Proper Names, and a Vocabulary.

C. K.

## MISCELLANEOUS TRANSLATIONS

In 1920 Messrs G. Bell and Sons (London) issued separately Mr. Benjamin Bickley Rogers's translation of the Wasps of Aristophanes. There is nothing in this volume to show that it is a reprint. Mr. Rogers's translations of all the plays of Aristophanes into corresponding meters is well known. A complete edition, covering all the plays, appeared in 1916. See a notice of his version of the Clouds, by Professor Humphreys, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 10.221; a notice I wrote of the second edition of the Wasps (text, translations, and notes) in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 10. 200; and Dr. Luce's reference to Mr. Rogers's work, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.120. Some six pages of Notes (99-104) are appended to the present volume.

In 1919 the same publishers had issued, separately, Mr. Rogers's rendering of the Clouds of Aristophanes. In a brief Introduction (vii-xi), dated in April, 1919, Mr. Rogers states that this translation was originally written while he was still an undergraduate at Oxford, and that it was first published in 1852, with the Greek text and notes; it was republished, with some slight revision, as part of the complete edition, in 1916. There are, in the present booklet, five pages of notes (107-111).

One cannot forbear to remark on the extraordinary circumstance that Dr. Rogers was alive, and still keenly interested in Aristophanes 67 years after the appearance of his first published attempt at translation of that author. It makes one think of the fact that Johannes Vahlen twice edited fragments of the Annales of Ennius—in 1854 and 1903 (see American Journal of Philology 32. 1-3).

C. K.

## AMERICAN FIELD SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS FOR FRENCH UNIVERSITIES

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13.54-55, 14.64 an account was given of the establishment of Fellowships, in French Universities, as an enduring memorial of the Field Service Men, from America, who lost their lives in the Great War.

For 1922-1923, Fellowships not to exceed twenty-five in number will be available. Of these, those in Anthropology, Archaeology and History of Art, and Classical Languages and Literature may be of interest to readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. The Fellowships have the annual value of \$200 and 10,000 francs, and are renewable for a second year.

Those interested should write to Dr. I. Kandel, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

C. K.

### NEW YORK STATE TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION CLASSICAL SECTION

The annual meeting of the Classical Section of the New York State Teachers' Association will be held on Tuesday and Wednesday, November 22-23, in Room 190, Hutchinson High School, Buffalo. The programme is as follows:

Tuesday (9 o'clock), Meeting of the Executive Committee; (10 o'clock), Latin Salutatory, Professor Theodore A. Miller, University of Rochester; Latin Response, Miss Helena L. Duschak, Masten Park High School, Buffalo; Address by the President, A Plea for More Oral Reading of Latin, Professor Donald Blythe Durham, Hamilton College; The Ideal Element in the Politics of Cicero, Miss Margaret Y. Henry, Wadleigh High School, New York City; The National Investigation of the Teaching of Latin, Dr. Mason D. Gray, East High School, Rochester.

Tuesday (1.30), Business Meeting; The Laboratory Method in the Teaching of Beginners, Dean Rollin H. Tanner, Denison University; Some Observations on the Teaching and Study of Latin and Greek, Professor Philip B. Goetz, University of Buffalo; Observations on the Aeneid, Professor Charles Knapp, Barnard College; Recent Discoveries in Pompeii, Professor Francis W. Kelsey, University of Michigan.

Wednesday (10 o'clock), Report of The Classical Reading League, Professor Willis P. Woodman, Hobart College; Round Table on Problems in Two Year Latin, conducted by Mr. S. Dwight Arms, Specialist in Ancient Languages, State Department of Education, Albany.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

DONALD BLYTHE DURHAM

### HORACE, SERMONES 1. 3. 29-34 ONCE MORE

To the list of instances of the repeated adversative conjunction, presented by Professor Knapp in THE

CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14. 153-154, and supplemented by Mr. Barss in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.8, may be added the following example from Tacitus, Annales 1. 102. (a passage in Oratio Obliqua): Sane Cassii et Brutorum exitus paternis inimicitiis datos, quamquam fas sit privata odia publicis utilitatibus remittere; sed Pompeium imagine pacis, sed Lepidum specie amicitiae deceptos . . .

HUNTER COLLEGE

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

### KIPLING AND HORACE

It occurs to me in connection with Professor H.W. Gilmer's article, The Classical Element in the Poems of Rudyard Kipling, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.178, that the phrase "splendaciously mendacious", which occurs in Kipling's poem Poseidon's Law, is a flippant rendering of *splendide mendax*, Horace, Carm. 3. 11. 35.

UNION COLLEGE

HARRISON C. COFFIN

### THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON AND CAESAR

Samuel Rogers's Table Talk contains many things that are of marked interest to classical students. One passage in particular may be cited here. It is to be found among the reminiscences of the Duke of Wellington, under date of November 24, 1840: "Had Caesar's Commentaries with me in India, and learned much from them, fortifying my camp every night as he did. I passed over the rivers as he did; by means of baskets and boats of basket work; only I think I improved upon him, constructing them into bridges, always fortifying them, and leaving them guarded, to return by them if necessary".

BOALT HALL OF LAW,  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MAX RADIN